

θ_{13} , Rare Decays and Leptonic CP Violation

Qaisar Shafi^a and Zurab Tavartkiladze^b

^a*Bartol Research Institute, Department of Physics and Astronomy
University of Delaware, Newark, DE 19716, USA*

^b*Department of Physics, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK 74078, USA*

Abstract

We introduce a flavor $\mathcal{U}(1)$ symmetry à la Froggatt-Nielsen to explain the magnitude of the CKM mixing angles as well bilarge mixing in the neutrino sector. In the framework of GUTs we also estimate the magnitude of the third leptonic mixing angle θ_{13} . Estimates for rare leptonic decays such as $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$ are also provided. Finally, leptogenesis is exploited for estimating the magnitude of leptonic CP violation.

1 Introduction: Models of Neutrino Oscillations and $\mathcal{U}(1)$ Flavor Symmetry

In recent years atmospheric [1] and solar [2] neutrino data have confirmed the existence of neutrino oscillations. A global analysis [3], [4] for the oscillation parameters yields

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta m_{\text{sol}}^2 &= 7.9 \cdot 10^{-5} \text{eV}^2, & \Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2 &= 2.4 \cdot 10^{-3} \text{eV}^2, \\ \sin^2 \theta_{12} &= 0.314, & \sin^2 \theta_{23} &= 0.44.\end{aligned}\tag{1}$$

Apart from the fact that at least two of the neutrinos are massive, the most exciting aspect about this data is the fact that it indisputably points to new physics beyond the SM/MSSM¹. This is so because the scale corresponding to the atmospheric anomaly is ≈ 0.05 eV, while at the renormalizable level, both the SM and MSSM (with no matter parity violation, i.e. stable LSP) gives $m_\nu = 0$. Non-renormalizable $d = 5$ operators $\frac{(lh_u)^2}{M_*}$ contribute to the neutrino mass, and with a cut off $M_* \sim M_{\text{Pl}} = 2.4 \cdot 10^{18}$ GeV give rise to neutrino masses $\delta m_\nu \sim (10^{-5} - 10^{-4})$ eV, which is way too small. Therefore, some extension of the SM/MSSM is needed, and presumably the simplest way is to introduce right-handed neutrino (RHN) states ν^c . With suitably arranged Dirac and Majorana couplings of the ν^c s, neutrino masses of the desired magnitude can be generated via the see-saw mechanism [5].

The third leptonic mixing angle θ_{13} has not yet been measured but a useful upper bound exists,

$$\theta_{13} \lesssim 0.2, \tag{2}$$

provided by the CHOOZ experiment [6]. Looking at (1) and (2) one can try to understand the origin of two large mixing angles ($\theta_{12} \simeq 35^\circ$, $\theta_{23} \simeq 42^\circ$) and a suppressed third angle ($\theta_{13} \lesssim 12^\circ$). It is desirable to have a framework which, together with neutrino masses, provides some understanding of these facts. One should note that the lepton mixing matrix $U_{\alpha i}^l$ (where $\alpha, i = 1, 2, 3$ are indices which label the flavor and neutrino mass eigenstates respectively), carries contributions not only from the neutral lepton sector but also from the charged lepton sector. An understanding of lepton mixings requires a close look also at the charged fermion sector.

The hierarchies between charged fermion Yukawa couplings and the CKM mixing elements can be parameterized by the parameter $\lambda \simeq 0.2$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_t &\sim 1, & \lambda_u : \lambda_c : \lambda_t &\sim \lambda^8 : \lambda^4 : 1, \\ \lambda_b &\sim \lambda_\tau \sim \frac{m_b}{m_t} \tan \beta, & \lambda_d : \lambda_s : \lambda_b &\sim \lambda^4 : \lambda^2 : 1.\end{aligned}$$

¹Later we will consider supersymmetric constructions because of various theoretical and phenomenological motivations. However, the discussion concerning the fermion sector can be applied also to non-SUSY constructions.

$$\lambda_e : \lambda_\mu : \lambda_\tau \sim \lambda^5 : \lambda^2 : 1 .$$

$$V_{us} \approx \lambda , \quad V_{cb} \approx \lambda^2 , \quad V_{ub} = \lambda^4 - \lambda^3 , \quad (3)$$

where the MSSM parameter $\tan \beta = \frac{v_u}{v_d}$. The lepton mixing angles are large in comparison to the CKM mixing elements, with θ_{13} a possible exception. What is the reason for this apparent mismatch between the lepton and quark mixings?

Since symmetries play a central role in particle physics, our intention is to gain some understanding of the observed mass hierarchies and the magnitudes of the various mixing angles using symmetry arguments. We can postulate a flavor symmetry G_F which acts in the flavor space and require invariance of the action under the transformation

$$f_\alpha \rightarrow (U_F)_\alpha^\beta f_\beta , \quad (4)$$

where f_α indicates the fermion flavor and U_F is a transformation matrix (in flavor space) determined by the appropriate representation of G_F . Since the Lagrangian is restricted by G_F , the structure of the fermion mass matrices are (completely) determined by the flavor symmetry breaking pattern.

The simplest realization of this picture is to consider an Abelian $\mathcal{U}(1)$ flavor symmetry [7]. Then the transformation in (4) is $(U_F)_\alpha^\beta = e^{iQ[f_\alpha]}\delta_\alpha^\beta$, where $Q[f_\alpha]$ is the $\mathcal{U}(1)$ charge of f_α . By an appropriate charge assignment it is possible to generate the desired hierarchies between charged fermion masses and the CKM mixing elements. However, a self consistent neutrino sector needs a more careful treatment. First of all, one should generate neutrino masses m_i with the property

$$\frac{|m_2^2 - m_1^2|}{|m_3^2 - m_2^2|} \simeq \frac{1}{30} \sim \lambda^2 . \quad (5)$$

It is desirable to have an understanding of this ‘little’ hierarchy based on $\mathcal{U}(1)$. Moreover, the lepton mixing angles compatible with (1), (2) should be generated. The task becomes more involved if we wish to realize this program within Grand Unification (GUT), which relates quarks and leptons. Before discussing GUTs, we consider the possibilities offered by $\mathcal{U}(1)$ flavor symmetry to realize bi-large neutrino mixings and suppressed θ_{13} .

The data in (1) says nothing, in principle, about absolute values of neutrino masses². This leaves us with several distinct possibilities for the neutrino mass pattern.

1. Three (quasi)-degenerate neutrinos.

We may have a situation with

$$m_1 \simeq m_2 \approx m_3 \gg \sqrt{\Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2} , \quad (6)$$

²The constraint on the sum of the absolute values of neutrino masses provided by combining the recent WMAP [8] and galaxy clustering data is $\sum_i |m_i| \leq 0.68$ eV. From the WMAP three-year data alone the bound found in [9] is $\sum_i |m_i| \leq 2.0$ eV.

in which case tiny splittings between masses are required to explain neutrino oscillations. This pattern has some theoretical problems. Neutrino mass matrices with ‘near’ degenerate mass spectrum usually suffer from renormalization group (RG) instabilities [10]. The RG corrections may either give undesirable splitting between masses or they may fix the mixing angles to be small. In addition, it is difficult to generate degenerate neutrino mass texture with the help of only $\mathcal{U}(1)$ flavor symmetry. For this purpose non-Abelian symmetries are usually more efficient [11]. With local non-Abelian symmetries, special care must be exercised to ensure anomaly cancellations.

2. Inverted hierarchical neutrinos.

In this case the neutrino spectrum is

$$m_1 \simeq m_2, \quad m_3 \approx 0. \quad (7)$$

This spectrum, when confronted with the data in (1) dictates that $m_{1,2} \simeq \sqrt{\Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2}$, $m_3 \lesssim \sqrt{\Delta m_{\text{sol}}^2}$. It is possible to achieve this spectrum via couplings respecting $L_e - L_\mu - L_\tau$ symmetry [12], or by $\mathcal{U}(1)$ flavor symmetry [13], [14], [15]. However, the angle θ_{12} , it turns out is nearly maximal which is excluded. The texture is stable under RG corrections [14], and no improvement from radiative effects is expected. To be viable, there should be contributions which strongly violate the $\mathcal{U}(1)$ symmetry [15]. However, this must be done in such a way as to maintain the hierarchy in (5), keeping at the same time θ_{13} adequately suppressed. This requires a certain amount of fine tuning.

3. Hierarchical neutrinos.

This scenario has the following mass pattern

$$m_1 \lesssim m_2 \ll m_3, \quad (8)$$

which means that $m_3 \simeq \sqrt{\Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2}$ and $m_2 \sim \sqrt{\Delta m_{\text{sol}}^2}$. One should note that there is a wide class of neutrino textures which provide this spectrum. It includes democratic textures [16] which are compatible with $\mathcal{U}(1)$ flavor symmetry [17]. The (normal) hierarchical structures are usually stable under RG effects [18], and for these reasons will be the main focus of our attention for the remainder of the paper. We would like to stress, however, that the other two scenarios are not excluded by the experimental data.

The democratic approach [16], [17] to atmospheric and solar neutrino oscillations (also called neutrino anarchy) assumes that all couplings involving the neutrino flavors are comparable in size. This implies that large mixing angles could be natural in this setting, which can be successfully realized with $\mathcal{U}(1)$ flavor symmetry. The latter’s role is also important for generating the hierarchies observed in charged fermion masses and the CKM mixing elements (generated by distinct transformations of right-handed leptons and quarks). The left-handed lepton doublets all have the same transformation properties, i.e. $Q[l_1] = Q[l_2] = Q[l_3]$, giving rise to large θ_{12} and θ_{23} . However, by the same reasoning a priori one expects to have large (not suppressed) θ_{13} . Also, the hierarchy

in (5) is not understood. The latter, with the hierarchical mass spectrum, means that $\frac{m_2}{m_3} \sim 0.2$. It is possible to get such a mass ratio within a democratic scenario if we arrange that at leading level, the neutrino mass matrix has only one massive eigenstate. With additional small perturbations, the mass of the second eigenstate will be somewhat suppressed. Within the see-saw scenario, this can be fulfilled by the single RHN dominance [19]. This mechanism works well within various GUTs augmented with $\mathcal{U}(1)$ flavor symmetry [20], [21]. As far as θ_{13} is concerned, its suppression requires more effort. It is possible to introduce additional discrete symmetries [22] which guarantee a suppressed value of θ_{13} . However, it is difficult to realize such a possibility in GUTs. Thus, in the framework of grand unification with $\mathcal{U}(1)$ flavor symmetry it is challenging to have bi-large neutrino mixings, keep θ_{13} sufficiently suppressed, and also explain the ratio $\frac{m_2}{m_3} \sim \lambda$. In this paper we will take up this challenge and develop a framework which is also applicable to GUTs such as $SO(10)$ [23] and flipped $SU(5)$ [24]. An important role will be played by the double see-saw mechanism which offers new ways for successful model building. For example, the flipped $SU(5)$ GUT of [24] gives $\theta_{13} \approx 0.075$.

2 Neutrino Textures and a Prediction of θ_{13}

2.1 Democracy with controlled zeros

Consider a ‘light’ neutrino texture consisting of two parts,

$$m_\nu = m_\nu^{(0)} + m_\nu^{(1)} , \quad (9)$$

where the leading part $m_\nu^{(0)}$ will be responsible for the atmospheric neutrino anomaly, while the sub-leading entry $m_\nu^{(1)}$ will ensure large angle solar neutrino oscillations. We will assume that

$$m_\nu^{(0)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha^2 & \alpha \\ 0 & \alpha & 1 \end{pmatrix} \frac{m}{1+|\alpha|^2} , \quad \text{with} \quad \alpha \sim 1 , \quad (10)$$

while

$$m_\nu^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\alpha}^2 & \bar{\alpha} & 0 \\ \bar{\alpha} & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} m' , \quad \text{with} \quad \bar{\alpha} \sim 1 . \quad (11)$$

The two matrices contain 2×2 sub-matrices with democratic structure and zero determinants. We can thus refer to democratic textures with controlled zeros³. Next we assume that

$$m \gg m' . \quad (12)$$

³Later on, these textures will be justified by symmetry arguments.

This structure of m_ν already points to a hierarchical neutrino mass spectrum. The leading eigenvalue of m_ν is close to the single non-zero eigenvalue of (10), namely $m_{\nu_3} \simeq m$. Thus, the scale m is relevant for atmospheric neutrino oscillations. Moreover, the 2-3 mixing angle θ_{23} is naturally large. The second non-zero eigenvalue of m_ν is determined by the scale m' responsible for solar neutrino oscillations. The angle θ_{12} is also naturally large. The 1-2 and 2-3 rotations also induce a non-zero mixing θ_{13} . A limited number of the parameters in the neutrino mass matrix allows one to calculate the θ_{13} in terms of other oscillation parameters. In refs. [25,26], by invoking two RHNs and specific neutrino Dirac Yukawa texture (in a basis of diagonal RHN mass matrix) a prediction for θ_{13} was obtained. One of our main goals is to provide a derivation of the textures in (10), (11) based on symmetry arguments. Before doing this, let us give an estimate for θ_{13} .

The leading part of m_ν can be diagonalized by the transformation $U_{23}^T m_\nu^{(0)} U_{23} = \overline{m}_\nu^{(0)} = \text{Diag}(0, 0, m)$, with

$$U_{23} = P \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & c_{23} & s_{23} \\ 0 & -s_{23} & c_{23} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (13)$$

where $c_{23} \equiv \cos \theta_{23}$, $s_{23} \equiv \sin \theta_{23}$, and

$$\tan \theta_{23} = |\alpha|, \quad P = \text{Diag}(1, e^{i\chi}, 1), \quad \chi = -\text{Arg}(\alpha). \quad (14)$$

By this rotation, the sub-leading part transforms into

$$\overline{m}_\nu^{(1)} = U_{23}^T m_\nu^{(1)} U_{23} = \tilde{P} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\alpha}^2 & c_{23}\bar{\alpha} & s_{23}\bar{\alpha} \\ c_{23}\bar{\alpha} & c_{23}^2 & c_{23}s_{23} \\ s_{23}\bar{\alpha} & c_{23}s_{23} & s_{23}^2 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \tilde{P} m', \quad (15)$$

where $\tilde{P} = \text{Diag}(1, e^{-i\chi}, e^{-i\chi})$.

The matrix $\overline{m}_\nu = \overline{m}_\nu^{(0)} + \overline{m}_\nu^{(1)}$ is diagonalized by the transformation $U_{12}^T U_{13}^T \overline{m}_\nu U_{13} U_{12} = m_\nu^{\text{diag}}$, where

$$U_{12} \simeq P' \cdot \begin{pmatrix} c_{12} & s_{12} & 0 \\ -s_{12} & c_{12} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad U_{13} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} c_{13}e^{i\delta} & 0 & s_{13}e^{i\delta} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -s_{13} & 0 & c_{13} \end{pmatrix},$$

$$P' = \text{Diag}(e^{i\chi'}, e^{-i\chi'}, e^{-i\chi'}) , \quad \chi' = -\text{Arg}(\bar{\alpha}), \quad \delta = -\text{Arg}\left(\frac{m'\bar{\alpha}}{m}\right), \quad (16)$$

$$\tan \theta_{12} = \frac{|\bar{\alpha}|}{c_{23}}, \quad \tan \theta_{13}^\nu = \left| \frac{m'}{m} \right| s_{23} |\bar{\alpha}|, \quad (17)$$

$$m_\nu^{\text{diag}} = \text{Diag}(0, m_2, m), \quad m_2 = m'(|\bar{\alpha}|^2 + c_{23}^2). \quad (18)$$

Using (17), (18) and the relation $|\frac{m_2}{m}| \simeq \sqrt{\frac{\Delta m_{\text{sol}}^2}{\Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2}}$, we find ⁴

$$\tan \theta_{13}^\nu \simeq \sqrt{\frac{\Delta m_{\text{sol}}^2}{\Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2}} \frac{\tan \theta_{12} \tan \theta_{23}}{1 + \tan^2 \theta_{12}} , \quad (19)$$

where we have introduced the superscript ' ν ' in order to indicate that this contribution comes from the neutrino sector⁵. Using the current data [4], we find

$$\theta_{13}^\nu \simeq 0.05 - 0.14 . \quad (20)$$

For the central values given in (1), (19) yields $(\theta_{13}^\nu)^{\text{cent}} \simeq 0.075$.

It is possible to consider a slightly modified texture which yields a similar (but slightly modified) relation. Namely, we leave the leading part $m_\nu^{(0)}$ unchanged, but for the sub-leading part take

$$m_\nu^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\alpha}^2 & 0 & \bar{\alpha} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \bar{\alpha} & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} m' , \quad \text{with} \quad \bar{\alpha} \sim 1 . \quad (21)$$

We then find

$$\tan \theta_{13}^\nu \simeq \sqrt{\frac{\Delta m_{\text{sol}}^2}{\Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2}} \frac{\tan \theta_{12} \cot \theta_{23}}{1 + \tan^2 \theta_{12}} , \quad (22)$$

which gives

$$\theta_{13}^\nu \simeq 0.05 - 0.15 , \quad (\theta_{13}^\nu)^{\text{cent}} \simeq 0.094 . \quad (23)$$

For these estimates we have assumed that the charged lepton sector practically does not contribute to θ_{12} and θ_{23} mixings which are determined largely from the neutral sector. This takes place in many GUT models as we will discuss below. In the (1,3) element of the lepton mixing matrix, if the charged lepton sector also contributes, we can write

$$\theta_{13} \equiv |U_{e3}^l| \simeq |\tan \theta_{13}^\nu - \epsilon_E s_{23} e^{i\rho}| \cos \theta_{13}^\nu , \quad (24)$$

where ϵ_E is related to the rotations coming from the charged lepton sector, and ρ is some (undetermined) phase. We have parameterized the third mixing angle in this form (24) for convenience, which should become clear later on. With little or no information about the charged lepton sector we are unable to predict U_{e3}^l . Thus, it is important to take a close look at the charged fermion

⁴A similar suppression $\theta_{13} \sim \frac{m_{\text{sol}}}{m_{\text{atm}}}$ was obtained in a democratic scenario [22] with discrete symmetries. We note, however, that it is hard to realize this within a GUT supplemented by symmetry arguments. For some recent works with flavor symmetries and suppressed θ_{13} see [29]. For a review of the models and list of references, see [30], [31].

⁵The physical leptonic mixing angle $\theta_{13} \equiv |U_{e3}^l|$ can receive sizable contribution also from the charged lepton sector.

sector, and GUTs are particularly interesting from this viewpoint because they may closely relate charged and neutral sectors, thereby providing more information on the size of ϵ_E . For instance, if $\epsilon_E \ll 0.1$, then θ_{13} is given by θ'_{13} to a good approximation.

Before proceeding further with this, we first wish to have some understanding on how the textures (10) and (11) can be generated from a $\mathcal{U}(1)$ flavor symmetry.

2.2 Deformed ‘Dirac’ couplings and Double See-Saw

We begin with the charged fermion sector aiming to obtain hierarchical masses and suppressed CKM mixings by $\mathcal{U}(1)$ symmetry. We introduce a MSSM singlet superfield X with $\mathcal{U}(1)$ charge $Q[X] = -1$. The VEV of the scalar component of X breaks $\mathcal{U}(1)$, and we assume that $\frac{\langle X \rangle}{M_{\text{Pl}}} \equiv \lambda (\simeq 0.2)$. With suitable $\mathcal{U}(1)$ charge prescriptions for the quark and lepton families, we can realize desirable hierarchies expressed in powers of λ , an important expansion parameter which plays a central role in our construction.

The entries in the CKM matrix and the quark mass hierarchies suggest the following $\mathcal{U}(1)$ charge assignments:

$$\begin{aligned} Q[q_1] &= a + 3, \quad Q[q_2] = a + 2, \quad Q[q_3] = a, \\ Q[u_1^c] &= b + 5, \quad Q[u_2^c] = b + 2, \quad Q[u_3^c] = b, \quad Q[d_1^c] = c + 1, \quad Q[d_2^c] = Q[d_3^c] = c, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

with a, b, c not yet determined. For the MSSM higgs doublets we have

$$Q[h_u] = -(a + b), \quad Q[h_d] = n - a - c. \quad (26)$$

The Yukawa textures for up and down type quarks are respectively

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{matrix} u_1^c & u_2^c & u_3^c \\ q_1 \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^8 & \lambda^5 & \lambda^3 \\ \lambda^7 & \lambda^4 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda^5 & \lambda^4 & 1 \end{pmatrix} & q_2 \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^4 & \lambda^3 & \lambda^3 \\ \lambda^3 & \lambda^2 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix} h_u, \quad \begin{matrix} d_1^c & d_2^c & d_3^c \\ q_1 \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^4 & \lambda^3 & \lambda^3 \\ \lambda^3 & \lambda^2 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} & q_2 \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^4 & \lambda^3 & \lambda^3 \\ \lambda^3 & \lambda^2 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix} \lambda^n h_d. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

It is easy to see that these textures indeed yield the quark Yukawa hierarchies and CKM mixings given in (3). An integer $n \geq 0$ determines the value of $\tan \beta$.

Next we focus on the lepton sector. Taking the assignments

$$\begin{aligned} Q[l_1] &= d + k, \quad Q[l_2] = d + m, \quad Q[l_3] = d, \\ Q[e_1^c] &= a + c - d + r, \quad Q[e_2^c] = a + c - d + p, \quad Q[e_3^c] = a + c - d, \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

the charged lepton Yukawa couplings are

$$\begin{matrix} l_1 & l_2 & l_3 \\ e_1^c \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^{k+r} & \lambda^{m+r} & \lambda^r \\ \lambda^{k+p} & \lambda^{m+p} & \lambda^p \\ \lambda^k & \lambda^m & 1 \end{pmatrix} & e_2^c \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^{k+r} & \lambda^{m+r} & \lambda^r \\ \lambda^{k+p} & \lambda^{m+p} & \lambda^p \\ \lambda^k & \lambda^m & 1 \end{pmatrix} & e_3^c \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^{k+r} & \lambda^{m+r} & \lambda^r \\ \lambda^{k+p} & \lambda^{m+p} & \lambda^p \\ \lambda^k & \lambda^m & 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix} \lambda^n h_d. \quad (29)$$

The charged lepton mass hierarchies are reproduced if $m + p = 2$ and $k + r = 5$.

As far as the numbers m, k, p, r are concerned, in the MSSM framework they are not determined. Thus, some comments are in order. If we take $m = k = 0$ we have a democratic scenario which would naturally yield large θ_{12} and θ_{23} . However, problems due to large θ_{13} and the ratio $\sqrt{\Delta m_{\text{sol}}^2 / \Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2}$ arise, and their resolution especially within GUTs is difficult. Also, this choice would reduce the success of the predictive texture presented in the previous subsection. Thus, we prefer a situation with $m \geq 1$ and $k > m$ (or a selection of m and k in such a way as to forbid (3.1) and (3,2) entries in the matrix of (29)). With this choice θ_{12} and θ_{23} are determined from the neutral sector and a prediction for θ_{13} with the neutrino texture suggested earlier can work. This option is also motivated from the viewpoint of GUTs because often in models like $SO(10)$ and E_6 , we expect suppressed contributions from the charged lepton sector. No other restrictions on these numbers are imposed for the time being. (Note that if, for example, $k \geq 2 + m$ the contribution to the third mixing angle is suppressed and θ_{13} is determined from the neutral lepton sector.)

Next let us introduce right-handed neutrinos. They are automatically present in models which include a gauged $U(1)_{B-L}$ symmetry and/or left-right symmetries such as $SO(10)$. From $SU(2)_R$ we expect

$$Q[\nu_\alpha^c] = Q[e_\alpha^c] , \quad (30)$$

and therefore neutrino Dirac masses will be induced from the couplings⁶

$$\begin{pmatrix} l_1 \\ l_2 \\ l_3 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \nu_1^c & \nu_2^c & \nu_3^c \\ \lambda^{k+r} & \lambda^{k+p} & \lambda^k \\ \lambda^{m+r} & \lambda^{m+p} & \lambda^m \\ \lambda^r & \lambda^p & 1 \end{pmatrix} \lambda^{c-b} h_u , \quad (31)$$

where we have assumed that $c-b \geq 0$ is integer. With the Dirac mass matrix of (31) and invoking the see-saw, one can see that it is hard to get desirable bi-large neutrino oscillations in a straightforward way. Note also that in minimal $SO(10)$ or E_6 we have the relations $m_D = M_U \propto M_D = M_E$. Then, in (2,2) and (1,1) entries of m_D, M_D, M_E , the exponents λ^4 and λ^8 respectively will remain. These are unacceptably small contributions for the light down quarks and charged leptons.

To resolve these problems some extension is needed, with care taken to avoid the relation $m_D = M_U$. There are some relations between neutral and charged sectors in GUTs, and the hope is to find hints on how the neutrino Dirac couplings should be modified. A simple extension of $SO(10)$, which cures problems in the charged fermion sector, is to introduce matter 10-plets [32], [21] [33]. For instance, in the $SO(10)$ model of [23] this, together with improved quark and charged lepton sectors, leads to deformed neutrino Dirac couplings. The latter, as we will see shortly, is a crucial ingredient for generating the desirable texture.

⁶For simplicity we will proceed with relation (30). However, an unrestricted $U(1)$ charge assignment for ν_i^c is possible.

We begin by introducing additional vector-like states which can modify the neutrino Dirac mass matrix. Introducing the vector-like lepton doublets $L, \bar{L}$ and MSSM singlet scalar superfields $S, \bar{S}$ with $\mathcal{U}(1)$ charges

$$Q[L] = x, \quad Q[\bar{L}] = \bar{x}, \quad Q[S] = -(m + b - c + d + \bar{x}), \quad Q[\bar{S}] = -(p - b + c - d + x), \quad (32)$$

the additional relevant couplings will be

$$\frac{\bar{S}}{M_{\text{Pl}}} L \nu_2^c h_u + S \lambda^{c-b} \bar{L} l_2 + M_{\text{Pl}} \lambda^{x+\bar{x}} \bar{L} L. \quad (33)$$

After substitution of appropriate VEVs we are dealing with the mass matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} l_1 \\ l_2 \\ l_3 \\ L \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \nu_1^c & \nu_2^c & \nu_3^c & \bar{L} \\ \lambda^{k+r} h_u & \lambda^{k+p} h_u & \lambda^k h_u & 0 \\ \lambda^{m+r} h_u & \lambda^{m+p} h_u & \lambda^m h_u & \langle S \rangle \\ \lambda^r h_u & \lambda^p h_u & h_u & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\langle \bar{S} \rangle h_u}{M_{\text{Pl}} \lambda^{c-b}} & 0 & M_{\text{Pl}} \frac{\lambda^{x+\bar{x}}}{\lambda^{c-b}} \end{pmatrix} \lambda^{c-b}. \quad (34)$$

With

$$\frac{\langle S \bar{S} \rangle}{M_{\text{Pl}}^2 \lambda^{x+\bar{x}}} = \lambda^{m_1}, \quad (35)$$

and assuming $m_1 < m + p$, integration of $L, \bar{L}$ states reduces (34) to the following 3×3 matrix

$$m_D \simeq \begin{pmatrix} l_1 \\ l_2 \\ l_3 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \nu_1^c & \nu_2^c & \nu_3^c \\ \lambda^{k+r} & \lambda^{k+p} & \lambda^k \\ \lambda^{m+r} & \lambda^{m_1} & \lambda^m \\ \lambda^r & \lambda^p & 1 \end{pmatrix} \lambda^{c-b} h_u. \quad (36)$$

Thus, the effective Dirac mass matrix is modified, with $L, \bar{L}$ states playing an important role. Note that there is l_2 - L mixing in (34),

$$L \supset \frac{\langle S \rangle}{M_{\text{Pl}}} \lambda^{b-c-x-\bar{x}} l_2. \quad (37)$$

This will be important for the sub-leading part of the neutrino mass matrix.

From the Dirac mass matrix (36), we see that a priori the value of θ_{23} mixing angle is expected to be small ($\sim \lambda^m$) because it is determined by the ratio of (2,3) and (3,3) elements. However, imagine that the state ν_3^c decouples by forming a very heavy state with another MSSM singlet N_3 . Then θ_{23} will be determined by the ratio of (2,2) and (3,2) elements, and if we select $m_1 = p$, θ_{23} can be large. Thus, there is no need to decouple the state ν_2^c . However, in order to have large θ_{12} mixing and zero (or appropriately suppressed) entries in the neutrino texture, the state ν_1^c must decouple. It is possible to realize all of this by introducing three additional GUT singlets, N_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$). With suitable couplings between these and the ν^c states, the desired goal can be achieved. This

mechanism was discussed in [34] and applied within various GUTs [21], [35]. Here we will use this idea for generating the desired dominant part of neutrino texture.

Assigning the following $\mathcal{U}(1)$ charges to N_i states

$$Q[N_1] = -(a + c - d + r) , \quad Q[N_2] = 0 , \quad Q[N_3] = -(a + c - d) , \quad (38)$$

and, for simplicity, assuming that r is non-integer [but $r + k$ is still integer, so the (1,1) element in (29) is kept], the relevant couplings are

$$M = \begin{matrix} & N_1 & N_2 & N_3 \\ \begin{matrix} \nu_1^c \\ \nu_2^c \\ \nu_3^c \end{matrix} & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda^{a+c-d+p} & \lambda^p \\ 0 & \lambda^{a+c-d} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix} M_{\text{Pl}} , \quad M_N = \begin{matrix} & N_1 & N_2 & N_3 \\ \begin{matrix} N_1 \\ N_2 \\ N_3 \end{matrix} & \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix} M_{\text{Pl}} . \quad (39)$$

The states ν_1^c and ν_3^c pair up with N_1 and N_3 respectively and decouple. However, although ν_2^c couples with N_2 it does not decouple because N_2 itself has a large mass.

From (36) and (39), the 9×9 mass matrix for neutral fermions is given by

$$\begin{matrix} & \nu & \nu^c & N \\ \begin{matrix} \nu \\ \nu^c \\ N \end{matrix} & \begin{pmatrix} 0 & m_D & 0 \\ m_D^T & 0 & M \\ 0 & M^T & M_N \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix} . \quad (40)$$

Integration of the heavy ν^c , N states leads to the light neutrino mass matrix given by the double see-saw formula:

$$m_\nu^{(0)} = m_D \frac{1}{M^T} M_N \frac{1}{M} m_D^T . \quad (41)$$

Taking $m_1 = p$, one can verify that

$$m_\nu^{(0)} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha^2 & \alpha \\ 0 & \alpha & 1 \end{pmatrix} \frac{m}{1+|\alpha|^2} , \quad (42)$$

where $\alpha \sim 1$ is a dimensionless coupling and $m \sim \frac{\langle h_u^{(0)} \rangle^2}{M_{\text{Pl}} \lambda^{2(a+b-d)}}$. This is indeed the form which we required for the leading contribution to m_ν .

As far as the sub-leading part is concerned, it can be generated through an additional singlet state $\mathcal{N}$. Since the additional part will be generated by a single state, its degeneracy will be due to the ‘dominance’ mechanism in [19]. In our case, an important role will be played by the state L which mixes with l_2 . With a $\mathcal{U}(1)$ charge prescription $Q[\mathcal{N}] = a + c - d - k + y$, the relevant couplings are

$$\lambda^{c-b+y} l_1 \mathcal{N} h_u + \lambda^{2d-p-k+y} \frac{\bar{S}}{M_{\text{Pl}}} L \mathcal{N} h_u + M_{\text{Pl}} \lambda^{2(a+c-d-k+y)} \mathcal{N}^2 . \quad (43)$$

Using (35), (37) and taking $d = c + k/2$, from (43) the effective couplings are

$$\lambda^{c-b+y} l_1 \mathcal{N} h_u + \lambda^{c-b+y} l_2 \mathcal{N} h_u + M_{\text{Pl}} \lambda^{2(a+c-d-k+y)} \mathcal{N}^2 . \quad (44)$$

Integrating out $\mathcal{N}$, from the couplings in (44) we can generate $m_\nu^{(1)}$ which has the form given in (11), with $m' \sim \frac{\langle h_u^{(0)} \rangle^2 \lambda^{2k}}{M_{\text{Pl}} \lambda^{2(a+b-d)}}$. With $k = 1/2$ we obtain

$$\frac{m'}{m} \sim \lambda . \quad (45)$$

Note also that with this selection of k , the $(3, 1)$, $(3, 2)$ elements in (29) vanish. Thus, θ_{13} acquires contributions only from the neutrino sector.

We have therefore generated a neutrino texture which yields bi-large neutrino mixing and predicts the value of θ_{13} . In addition, from $\mathcal{U}(1)$ charge assignments, we obtain $\frac{m'}{m} \sim \lambda$, which nicely accounts for the hierarchy in (5).

3 GUTs and the Value of θ_{13}

3.1 $SO(10)$ Example

The mechanism presented in the previous section can be successfully realized within various GUTs. In particular, the $SO(10)$ model of [23] has all the ingredients needed for the generation of neutrino textures of (9)-(11). In addition, the 1-2 mixing coming from the charged lepton sector is predicted to be $\theta_{e\mu} \simeq \sqrt{\frac{m_e}{m_\mu}}$. This gives a sizable contribution to $\theta_{13} \equiv |U_{e3}^l|$, for which we obtain

$$\theta_{13} \equiv |U_{e3}^l| \simeq \left| \tan \theta_{13}^\nu - \sqrt{\frac{m_e}{m_\mu}} s_{23} e^{i(\delta-\chi)} \right| \cos \theta_{13}^\nu , \quad (46)$$

where θ_{13}^ν angle is defined in (19), while the phase $\delta - \chi$ is unknown. We can estimate the possible range for $|U_{e3}^l|$. Namely, from (46),

$$\begin{aligned} \text{for } \theta_{13}^\nu = 0.05 , \quad \theta_{13} &= 0.01 - 0.09 , \\ \text{for } \theta_{13}^\nu = 0.14 , \quad \theta_{13} &= 0.08 - 0.2 . \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Thus, we find

$$\theta_{13} = 0.01 - 0.2 . \quad (48)$$

The upper range in (48) is consistent with the current experimental bound [6], while future experiments [36], [30] should be able to probe values close to 0.01.

3.2 Flipped $SU(5)$ GUT

Within flipped $SU(5)$ GUT it is also possible to generate the desirable neutrino texture (see [24] for details). Among other salient features, flipped $SU(5)$ predicts the following mixings from the charged lepton sector, $\theta_{e\mu} \sim \lambda^3$ and $\theta_{e\tau} \sim \lambda^5$. These contributions can be safely ignored in estimating $\theta_{13}(\equiv |U_{e3}^l|)$ which is then completely determined from the neutrino sector. According to (19),

$$\theta_{13} \simeq \theta_{13}^\nu = 0.05 - 0.14 \quad (\text{with central value close to } 0.075). \quad (49)$$

Below we discuss the leptonic rare decays and the Leptogenesis. These issues, within scenarios leading to similar neutrino mass matrix, have been discussed in [28] and [25–27] respectively. However, since these constructions are based on ad-hoc coupling textures, the angle θ_{13} is a free parameter (no contribution from the charged lepton sector was discussed). Our consideration, with well defined framework with $\mathcal{U}(1)$ flavor symmetry, predicting θ_{13} enables one to reduce number of parameters and increase the predictive power.

4 Rare Decays: $l_i \rightarrow l_j \gamma$

The see-saw mechanism which we have used for neutrino mass generation also provides a source for lepton flavor violating rare processes such as $l_\alpha \rightarrow l_\beta \gamma$ [37]. We assume flavor universality at M_{GUT} scale. Thus, flavor violation may arise if one or more of the RHN's mass is below M_{GUT} . In the scenario we presented in the previous sections such candidates are ν_2^c and $\mathcal{N}$. After integrating out the other heavy RHNs [from (39), (40), (44)], we have the following effective couplings

$$h_u l^T \lambda_D \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{N} \\ \nu_2^c \end{pmatrix} + (\mathcal{N}, \nu_2^c) \hat{M}_R \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{N} \\ \nu_2^c \end{pmatrix}, \quad (50)$$

with

$$\lambda_D = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\lambda}_1 & 0 \\ \bar{\lambda}_2 & \lambda_1 \\ 0 & \lambda_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{M}_R = \text{Diag}(M_1, M_2), \quad (51)$$

where

$$M_1 = M_{\mathcal{N}} \sim M_{\text{Pl}} \lambda^{2(a+c-d+y)-1}, \quad M_2 = M_{\nu_2^c} \sim M_{\text{Pl}} \lambda^{2(a+c-d+p)}, \\ \lambda_1 \sim \lambda_2 \sim \lambda^{c-b+p}, \quad \bar{\lambda}_1 \sim \bar{\lambda}_2 \sim \lambda^{c-b+y}. \quad (52)$$

One can easily check out that the neutrino mass matrix $m_\nu = (h_u^0)^2 \lambda_D \frac{1}{M_R} \lambda_D^T$ derived from (50), (51) coincides with the texture given in (9)-(11), with the following relations

$$\lambda_1/\lambda_2 = \alpha, \quad \bar{\lambda}_1/\bar{\lambda}_2 = \bar{\alpha}, \quad \frac{\lambda_2^2}{M_2} (h_u^0)^2 = \frac{m}{1 + |\alpha|^2}, \quad \frac{\bar{\lambda}_2^2}{M_1} (h_u^0)^2 = m'. \quad (53)$$

The (1,2) element of λ_D vanishes because we have taken $k = 1/2$.

Assuming $N = 1$ supergravity and universality of soft scalar masses at M_{GUT} , the non-universal contributions to the slepton masses are

$$(\delta m^2)_{ij} \approx -\frac{1}{8\pi^2} (A + 3) m_S^2 T_{ij}, \quad \text{with} \quad T_{ij} = \sum_{\alpha=1,2} (\lambda_D)_{i\alpha} \ln \frac{M_{\text{GUT}}}{M_\alpha} (\lambda_D^T)_{j\alpha}. \quad (54)$$

From (54), (51) one finds

$$T_{12} = \bar{\lambda}_1 \bar{\lambda}_2 \ln \frac{M_{\text{GUT}}}{M_1}, \quad T_{23} = \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \ln \frac{M_{\text{GUT}}}{M_2}, \quad T_{13} = 0. \quad (55)$$

Therefore one expects no $\tau \rightarrow e\gamma$ transition. In the models of [23], [24] it does not vanish but is strongly suppressed. For the other two channels, taking into account eqs. (53), (55) and the expressions given in [38], we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{BR}(\mu \rightarrow e\gamma) &= \frac{\alpha_{em}^3 [(\delta m^2)_{12}]^2}{G_F^2 m_S^8} \tan^2 \beta = \frac{\alpha_{em}^3 (A + 3)^2}{64\pi^4 G_F^2 m_S^4} (\bar{\lambda}_1 \bar{\lambda}_2)^2 \tan^2 \beta \ln^2 \frac{M_{\text{GUT}}}{M_1} = \\ &= \frac{\alpha_{em}^3 (A + 3)^2}{64\pi^4 G_F^2 m_S^4} \left(\frac{1 + \tan^2 \beta}{\tan \beta} \right)^2 \left(\frac{s_{12} c_{12} M_1 \sqrt{\Delta m_{\text{sol}}^2}}{c_{23} v^2} \right)^2 \ln^2 \frac{M_{\text{GUT}}}{M_1}, \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\text{BR}(\tau \rightarrow \mu\gamma)}{\text{BR}(\mu \rightarrow e\gamma)} &\simeq \left(\frac{s_{23}}{s_{12} c_{12} (1 + \tan^2 \theta_{12} + \tan^2 \theta_{23})} \right)^2 \frac{\Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2}{\Delta m_{\text{sol}}^2} \left(\frac{M_2}{M_1} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\ln M_{\text{GUT}}/M_2}{\ln M_{\text{GUT}}/M_1} \right)^2 \simeq \\ &= 12 \cdot \left(\frac{M_2}{M_1} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\ln M_{\text{GUT}}/M_2}{\ln M_{\text{GUT}}/M_1} \right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

For $A \sim 1$ we find

$$\text{BR}(\mu \rightarrow e\gamma) \simeq 1.2 \cdot 10^{-11} \left(\frac{250 \text{ GeV}}{m_S} \right)^4 \left(\frac{M_1}{2 \cdot 10^{11} \text{ GeV}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\ln M_{\text{GUT}}/M_1}{12.2} \right)^2, \quad \text{for } \tan \beta \simeq 60, \quad (58)$$

where we have selected the parameters such that the current experimental bound $\text{BR}(\mu \rightarrow e\gamma) \lesssim 1.2 \cdot 10^{-11}$ [39] is satisfied. For $M_1 \lesssim 4.5 \cdot 10^9 \text{ GeV}$ the branching ratio ($\text{BR}(\mu \rightarrow e\gamma) < 10^{-14}$) will be below the sensitivity expected in future experiments.

For $M_1 \gtrsim 4.5 \cdot 10^9 \text{ GeV}$, the process $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$ may be testable and we have three possible characteristic signatures for rare decays.

1) $M_2 > M_1$, which yields

$$\text{BR}(\mu \rightarrow e\gamma) \ll \text{BR}(\tau \rightarrow \mu\gamma) . \quad (59)$$

The branching ratio for $\tau \rightarrow \mu\gamma$ can easily reach the current experimental upper bound $\text{BR}(\tau \rightarrow \mu\gamma) \lesssim 6.8 \cdot 10^{-8}$ [40] for $M_2 \sim 30M_1$ (for parameters close to those given in eq. (58)). Thus, both $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$ and $\tau \rightarrow \mu\gamma$ are potentially testable. This region of parameter space is also favored by leptogenesis which we discuss in the next section.

2) $M_2 \sim M_1/4$, which gives

$$\text{BR}(\mu \rightarrow e\gamma) \sim \text{BR}(\tau \rightarrow \mu\gamma) , \quad (60)$$

3) $M_2 < M_1/10$, such that

$$\text{BR}(\mu \rightarrow e\gamma) \gg \text{BR}(\tau \rightarrow \mu\gamma) , \quad (61)$$

which means that if the branching of $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$ approaches the experimental bound ($\lesssim 1.2 \cdot 10^{-11}$), then $\tau \rightarrow \mu\gamma$ is expected to be well below its present and future sensitivity ($\sim 10^{-9}$).

Note that specific GUT scenarios can be more restrictive as far as dominant rare decays are concerned. For example, the flipped $SU(5)$ GUT presented in [24] with neutrino texture similar to those presented in the previous sections suggests possibility **1**). Hopefully, the ongoing (and planned) experiments will soon discriminate among the various possibilities.

5 Leptogenesis and Prediction for Neutrino CP Violation

The generation of predictive neutrino texture in our scenario occurs through the see-saw mechanism, and we now exploit this ingredient for leptogenesis [41]. We will see that our scheme allows us to relate CP violation in neutrino oscillations with the CP violation needed for leptogenesis.

For leptogenesis the two relevant right-handed neutrino states are $\mathcal{N}$ and ν_2^c . The lightest RHN is responsible for out of equilibrium decays, while ν_2^c appears through the loop contribution to CP violation. The effective couplings of these RHNs are given in (50), (51). It is possible to redefine the phases of appropriate states in such a way as to have real Majorana masses of two RHNs, and bring λ_D to the form

$$\lambda_D \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} |\bar{\lambda}_1| & 0 \\ |\bar{\lambda}_2|e^{i\bar{b}} & |\lambda_1| \\ 0 & |\lambda_2| \end{pmatrix} . \quad (62)$$

As we see, thanks to the specific texture realized by $\mathcal{U}(1)$ flavor symmetry, in this system only one (unremovable) phase appears⁷. The same (single) phase appears in the lepton mixing matrix.

With negligible contributions from the charged sector, the leptonic CP violation mainly arises from the neutrino sector. The corresponding Jarlskog invariant

$$\mathcal{J}^l = \text{Im} (U_{e2}^* U_{\mu 3}^* U_{e3} U_{\mu 2}) \quad (63)$$

measures the CP violation. Namely, we have

$$\sin 2\bar{b} = -\frac{4\mathcal{J}^l}{\theta_{13} \sin 2\theta_{12} \sin 2\theta_{23}}. \quad (64)$$

The lepton asymmetry arises from the out of equilibrium decays of $\mathcal{N}$ and is given by $\frac{n_L}{s} \simeq 10^{-3} \kappa_f \tilde{\epsilon}_1$ [42], where the efficiency factor is $\kappa_f \simeq 2.4 \cdot 10^{-2}$ in our model. The lepton asymmetry is partially converted to the observed baryon asymmetry via sphalerons [43]. Namely, $\frac{n_B}{s} = -\frac{8}{23} \frac{n_L}{s}$, so that

$$\frac{n_B}{s} \simeq -1.76 \cdot 10^{-6} \tilde{\epsilon}_1. \quad (65)$$

The $\tilde{\epsilon}_1$ comes from the interference of the tree and one loop decays,

$$\tilde{\epsilon}_1 = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \left(\sqrt{\xi} \ln \frac{1+\xi}{\xi} + \frac{2\sqrt{\xi}}{\xi-1} \right) I_{21}, \quad \xi = \frac{M_2^2}{M_1^2}, \quad (66)$$

$$I_{21} = \frac{\text{Im}[(\lambda_D^\dagger \lambda_D)_{21}^2]}{(\lambda_D^\dagger \lambda_D)_{11}} = \frac{|\lambda_1|^2 \sin 2\bar{b}}{1 + \tan^2 \theta_{12} c_{23}^2}. \quad (67)$$

From the neutrino sector we have $|\lambda_1|^2/M_2 \simeq \sqrt{\Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2} s_{23}^2 / (v \sin \beta)^2$, and with $\xi \gg 1$, we find from (66)

$$\tilde{\epsilon}_1 = -\frac{3}{2\pi} \frac{M_1 \sqrt{\Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2}}{v^2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\tan^2 \beta} \right) \frac{s_{23}^2}{1 + \tan^2 \theta_{12} c_{23}^2} \sin 2\bar{b}. \quad (68)$$

Combining (64), (65), (68), using parameters from the neutrino data and $\theta_{13} \simeq 0.05 - 0.14$ (obtained from our texture), we finally have

$$\frac{n_B}{s} \simeq -(1.7 - 4.2) \cdot 10^{-9} \left(\frac{M_1}{10^{11} \text{GeV}} \right) \left(1 + \frac{1}{\tan^2 \beta} \right) \mathcal{J}^l, \quad (69)$$

From the observed baryon asymmetry $(\frac{n_B}{s})^{\text{exp}} \simeq 9 \cdot 10^{-11}$, from (69) the leptonic CP violation is given by

$$\mathcal{J}^l = \begin{cases} -0.016; & \text{for } \tan \beta \sim 1 \\ -0.031; & \text{for } \tan \beta \gtrsim 10 \end{cases}. \quad (70)$$

Future experiments should be able to probe CP violation of this magnitude.

⁷Leptogenesis by postulating a texture similar to (51) was considered in [25].

Table 1: Values of $\text{BR}(\mu \rightarrow e\gamma)$ and $\mathcal{J}^l$ with $m_S \simeq 250$ GeV, $\tan\beta = 60$ and $n_B/s \simeq 9 \cdot 10^{-11}$.

M_1/GeV	$\text{BR}(\mu \rightarrow e\gamma) \times 10^{11}$	$\mathcal{J}^l \times 10^2$
10^{11}	0.3	-3.1
$2 \cdot 10^{11}$	1.2	-1.6
10^{12}	22	-0.31

Finally, note that for low values of $M_1 = M_{\mathcal{N}}$, in order to obtain the required scale for solar neutrino oscillation, the appropriate Yukawa couplings must be suppressed. This will also suppress rare decay processes. Thus, there is correlation between CP violation [see (69)] and $\text{BR}(\mu \rightarrow e\gamma)$. In Table 1 we display these two quantities for different choices of M_1 . It is intriguing that for $M_1 \approx 10^{11} - 10^{12}$ GeV, both $\mathcal{J}^l$ and rare decays can be probed by experiments, and, as was pointed out in the previous section, the decay $\tau \rightarrow \mu\gamma$ dominates over $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$.

6 Conclusions

Neutrino oscillation experiments have already proved the existence of new physics beyond the SM/MSSM, and the planned long baseline neutrino experiments [36], [30] should be able to probe the value of the third leptonic mixing angle θ_{13} down to $\sim 10^{-2}$. We have proposed neutrino mass textures using double see-saw which allow one to predict the magnitude of θ_{13} . Our construction includes a $\mathcal{U}(1)$ flavor symmetry for understanding the hierarchies between fermion masses and mixings. In this setting we have also investigated the rare decays, $l_i \rightarrow l_j\gamma$, which arise from the right handed neutrino states below the GUT scale. The process $\tau \rightarrow e\gamma$ turns out to be either absent or strongly suppressed, while for $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$ and $\tau \rightarrow \mu\gamma$, we find the interesting possibility that $\text{BR}(\mu \rightarrow e\gamma) \sim \text{BR}(\tau \rightarrow \mu\gamma)$.

In implementing leptogenesis we uncover the intriguing possibility that the lepton asymmetry is directly related to CP violation in neutrino oscillations. Thus, the construction enables us to estimate two unknown quantities from the neutrino sector, namely θ_{13} and the magnitude of CP violation.

Within a SUSY $SO(10)$ GUT we find $\theta_{13} \approx 0.01 - 0.2$, while in flipped $SU(5)$, $\theta_{13} \simeq 0.075$.

Acknowledgments

Z.T. would like to thank the Bartol Research Institute for warm hospitality during his visit.

References

- [1] S. Fukuda *et al.* [Super-Kamiokande Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 3999 (2000) [hep-ex/0009001].
- [2] S. Fukuda *et al.* [Super-Kamiokande Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **86** (2001) 5651 [hep-ex/0103032];
K. Eguchi *et al.* [KamLAND Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **90** (2003) 021802 [hep-ex/0212021].
- [3] M. Maltoni, T. Schwetz, M. A. Tortola and J. W. F. Valle, New J. Phys. **6** (2004) 122 [hep-ph/0405172].
- [4] G. L. Fogli, E. Lisi, A. Marrone, A. Palazzo and A. M. Rotunno, [hep-ph/0506307].
- [5] P. Minkowski, Phys. Lett. B **67** (1977) 421; M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond and R. Slansky, in it Supergravity eds. P. van Nieuwenhuizen and D.Z. Freedman (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1979) p. 315; T. Yanagida, *In Proceedings of the Workshop on the Baryon Number of the Universe and Unified Theories, Tsukuba, Japan, 13-14 Feb 1979*; R. N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanovic, Phys. Rev. Lett. **44** (1980) 912.
- [6] M. Apollonio *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. C **27** (2003) 331 [hep-ex/0301017].
- [7] C. D. Froggatt and H. B. Nielsen, Nucl. Phys. B **147** (1979) 277.
- [8] D.N. Spergel, et.al., *Three-Year Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) Observations: Implications for Cosmology*, <http://lambda.gsfc.nasa.gov/>.
- [9] M. Fukugita, K. Ichikawa, M. Kawasaki and O. Lahav, Phys. Rev. D **74** (2006) 027302 [astro-ph/0605362].
- [10] J. R. Ellis and S. Lola, Phys. Lett. B **458** (1999) 310 [hep-ph/9904279].
- [11] C. D. Carone and M. Sher, Phys. Lett. B **420** (1998) 83 [hep-ph/9711259];
C. Wetterich, Phys. Lett. B **451** (1999) 397 [hep-ph/9812426];
R. Barbieri, L. J. Hall, G. L. Kane and G. G. Ross, hep-ph/9901228;
S. Antusch and S. F. King, Nucl. Phys. B **705** (2005) 239 [hep-ph/0402121];
S. F. King, JHEP **0508** (2005) 105 [hep-ph/0506297]; See also references therein.
- [12] S. T. Petcov, Phys. Lett. B **110** (1982) 245;
R. Barbieri, L. J. Hall, D. R. Smith, A. Strumia and N. Weiner, JHEP **9812** (1998) 017 [hep-ph/9807235];

- A. S. Joshipura and S. D. Rindani, Eur. Phys. J. C **14** (2000) 85 [hep-ph/9811252];
R. N. Mohapatra, A. Perez-Lorenzana and C. A. de Sousa Pires, Phys. Lett. B **474** (2000) 355 [hep-ph/9911395];
W. Grimus and L. Lavoura, Phys. Rev. D **62** (2000) 093012 [hep-ph/0007011].
- [13] Q. Shafi and Z. Tavartkiladze, Phys. Lett. B **482** (2000) 145 [hep-ph/0002150];
S. F. King and N. N. Singh, Nucl. Phys. B **596** (2001) 81 [hep-ph/0007243].
- [14] Q. Shafi and Z. Tavartkiladze, hep-ph/0101350.
- [15] G. K. Leontaris, J. Rizos and A. Psallidas, Phys. Lett. B **597** (2004) 182 [hep-ph/0404129];
W. Grimus and L. Lavoura, J. Phys. G **31** (2005) 683 [hep-ph/0410279];
G. Altarelli and R. Franceschini, hep-ph/0512202.
- [16] M. Tanimoto, T. Watari and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. B **461** (1999) 345 [hep-ph/9904338];
L. J. Hall, H. Murayama and N. Weiner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84** (2000) 2572 [hep-ph/9911341];
N. Haba and H. Murayama, Phys. Rev. D **63** (2001) 053010 [hep-ph/0009174].
- [17] Q. Shafi and Z. Tavartkiladze, Phys. Lett. B **550** (2002) 172 [hep-ph/0208162]; Phys. Rev. D **67** (2003) 075007 [hep-ph/0210181]; Nucl. Phys. B **665** (2003) 469 [hep-ph/0303150];
G. Altarelli, F. Feruglio and I. Masina, JHEP **0301** (2003) 035 [hep-ph/0210342].
- [18] S. Antusch, J. Kersten, M. Lindner and M. Ratz, Nucl. Phys. B **674** (2003) 401 [arXiv:hep-ph/0305273].
- [19] D. Suematsu, Phys. Lett. B **392** (1997) 413 [hep-ph/9604242];
S. F. King, Phys. Lett. B **439** (1998) 350 [hep-ph/9806440];
S. Davidson and S. F. King, Phys. Lett. B **445**, 191 (1998) [hep-ph/9808296];
Q. Shafi and Z. Tavartkiladze, Phys. Lett. B **451**, 129 (1999) [hep-ph/9901243].
- [20] Q. Shafi and Z. Tavartkiladze, Phys. Lett. B **451** (1999) 129 [hep-ph/9901243]; Nucl. Phys. B **573** (2000) 40 [hep-ph/9905202].
- [21] Q. Shafi and Z. Tavartkiladze, Phys. Lett. B **487** (2000) 145 [hep-ph/9910314]; Nucl. Phys. B **665** (2003) 469 [hep-ph/0303150].
- [22] K. S. Babu, E. Ma and J. W. F. Valle, Phys. Lett. B **552** (2003) 207 [hep-ph/0206292];
T. Kitabayashi and M. Yasue, Phys. Rev. D **67** (2003) 015006 [hep-ph/0209294];
Q. Shafi and Z. Tavartkiladze, Phys. Lett. B **594** (2004) 177 [hep-ph/0401235];
A. S. Joshipura, hep-ph/0411154;
P. F. Harrison and W. G. Scott, Phys. Lett. B **594** (2004) 324 [hep-ph/0403278];

- N. Haba and K. Yoshioka, hep-ph/0511108;
R. N. Mohapatra and W. Rodejohann, Phys. Rev. D **72** (2005) 053001 [hep-ph/0507312]; See also references therein.
- [23] Q. Shafi and Z. Tavartkiladze, Phys. Lett. B **633** (2006) 595 [hep-ph/0509237].
- [24] Q. Shafi and Z. Tavartkiladze, hep-ph/0606188.
- [25] P. H. Frampton, S. L. Glashow and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. B **548** (2002) 119 [hep-ph/0208157].
- [26] A. Ibarra and G. G. Ross, Phys. Lett. B **575** (2003) 279 [hep-ph/0307051], Phys. Lett. B **591** (2004) 285 [hep-ph/0312138].
- [27] W. l. Guo and Z. z. Xing, Phys. Lett. B **583** (2004) 163 [hep-ph/0310326].
- [28] W. l. Guo, Phys. Rev. D **74** (2006) 113009 [hep-ph/0610174].
- [29] W. Rodejohann and M. A. Schmidt, Phys. Atom. Nucl. **69** (2006) 1833 [hep-ph/0507300];
N. V. Cortez and M. D. Tonasse, Phys. Rev. D **72** (2005) 073005 [hep-ph/0510143];
C. Hagedorn, M. Lindner and R. N. Mohapatra, JHEP **0606** (2006) 042 [hep-ph/0602244];
Y. Cai and H. B. Yu, Phys. Rev. D **74** (2006) 115005 [hep-ph/0608022];
Y. H. Ahn, C. S. Kim, S. K. Kang and J. Lee, Phys. Rev. D **75** (2007) 013012 [hep-ph/0610007];
H. K. Dreiner, C. Luhn, H. Murayama and M. Thormeier, hep-ph/0610026;
F. Caravaglios and S. Morisi, hep-ph/0611078.
- [30] M. G. Albrow *et al.*, hep-ex/0509019.
- [31] C. H. Albright, M. C. Chen, hep-ph/0608137.
- [32] Z. Berezhiani and Z. Tavartkiladze, Phys. Lett. B **409** (1997) 220 [hep-ph/9612232].
- [33] N. Maekawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **106** (2001) 401 [hep-ph/0104200];
N. Maekawa and T. Yamashita, Prog. Theor. Phys. **108** (2002) 719 [hep-ph/0205185].
- [34] Q. Shafi and Z. Tavartkiladze, Phys. Lett. B **448** (1999) 46 [hep-ph/9811463].
- [35] Q. Shafi and Z. Tavartkiladze, Nucl. Phys. B **552** (1999) 67 [hep-ph/9807502]; Nucl. Phys. B **573** (2000) 40 [hep-ph/9905202].
- [36] Y. Itow *et al.*, hep-ex/0106019;
D. Beavis *et al.*, hep-ex/0205040;
D. Ayres *et al.* [Nova Collaboration], hep-ex/0210005.

- [37] F. Borzumati, A. Masiero, Phys. Rev. Lett. **57** (1986) 961.
- [38] J. Hisano, T. Moroi, K. Tobe, M. Yamaguchi, Phys. Rev. D **53** (1996) 2442 [hep-ph/9510309].
- [39] M. L. Brooks *et al.* [MEGA Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **83** (1999) 1521 [hep-ex/9905013].
- [40] B. Aubert *et al.* [BABAR Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **95** (2005) 041802 [hep-ex/0502032];
B. Aubert *et al.* [BABAR Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **96** (2006) 041801 [hep-ex/0508012].
- [41] M. Fukugita and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. B **174** (1986) 45; For non-thermal leptogenesis, see
G. Lazerides and Q. Shafi, Phys. Lett. B **258** (1991) 305.
- [42] L. Covi, E. Roulet and F. Vissani, Phys. Lett. B **384** (1996) 169 [hep-ph/9605319];
G. F. Giudice, A. Notari, M. Raidal, A. Riotto and A. Strumia, Nucl. Phys. B **685** (2004) 89
[hep-ph/0310123].
- [43] V. A. Kuzmin, V. A. Rubakov and M. E. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Lett. B **155** (1985) 36.